

spread of nuclear arms and increasing regional security in the absence of NPT ratification.

The Canadian Government's stance remains unchanged. It is prepared to study such proposals on a case-by-case basis but it believes that to be effective, any proposals must meet certain requirements: the zone must apply to a defined geographic area; it must be based on proposals which emanate from and are agreed to by most countries in the area concerned, including the principal military powers; it must not give advantage to any state or group of states; it must contain adequate treaty assurances and means to verify that countries abide by their commitments; and it must not permit the development of an independent nuclear explosive capability in the area.¹

At the 42nd Session of the UNGA in 1987, Canada voted in support of related resolutions on the Treaty of Tlatelolco, Establishment of a Nuclear Weapon-free Zone in the Middle East (adopted without a vote), Establishment of a Nuclear Weapon-free Zone in South Asia, Denuclearization of Africa, Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace (adopted without a vote), and Zone of Peace and Cooperation in the South Atlantic.

As a result of Canada's NATO membership, it has always been opposed to the establishment of such zones in Central or Northern Europe or the Balkans. The Government believes that the establishment of zones in these areas would cast doubts on the effectiveness of the NATO deterrent and expose certain areas to the risk of Soviet attack, without making a genuine contribution to nuclear disarmament.

¹ DEA, Arms Control and Disarmament Division, "Canada's Position on Nuclear Weapon-free Zones," Disarmament Bulletin, Summer-Fall 1986, p. 12.